



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/588,645

05/15/2007

Uwe Limbeck

102063.56866US

9792

23911 7590 09/02/2009
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

LI, JUN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/588,645	Applicant(s) LIMBECK, UWE	
	Examiner JUN LI	Art Unit 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the instant case, claim 6 recites the limitation "the auxiliaries" in its parent claim 5 where is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1793

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
1. Claim 1-3 and 5-6, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rock et al (EP1113516).

Rock et al teach method to cold start a solid polymer membrane fuel cell wherein oxygen and hydrogen are supplied to the cell so that the reacted fuel causes the fuel cell to heat up from subfreezing temperature([0002], [0006], [0007], [0009], [0015], clms, Fig). Rock further teaches a high temperature (about 80°C) can be reached via heating a fuel cell stack (at a temperature about -20°C) by the electrical current drawn from the cell to supply additional heating to heating devices (e.g. IR heating) . Rock also discloses circulating a coolant with a combustor by use of a pump through the stack wherein after the fuel cell stack reaching a preset temperature the heating of the coolant is discontinued ([0016]).

All the recited limitations are either taught or expected from Rock et al, thus they are anticipated by or obvious over Rock et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the power from the fuel cell to

Art Unit: 1793

operate some auxiliaries such as compressor to supply reactants such as O₂, H₂ for a needed electrochemical reaction in fuel cell for providing internal heating for helping the fuel cell reach normal operation mode as shown by Rock.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rock et al (EP1113516) as applied to claim 1-3, 5-6, 12 above, and in view of Edlund (US6495277).

Rock is silent about operating the recited operating capacity and the starter battery.

Edlund teaches using a supplemental battery for the fuel cell processing assembly from an off to a start up mode wherein a control system (item 30) is used to control the amount of power drawn from the fuel cell stack (item 14) to prevent damage to the fuel cell stack (Fig 1, col 7 ln 57-67, col 8 ln 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to control the fuel cell capacity amount as shown by Edlund to practice fuel cell system of Rock because controlling the fuel cell capacity at a proper amount will help prevent fuel cell damage. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been obvious to operating such fuel cell at a probable capacity via routine optimization (See § MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] II).

3. Claim 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rock et al (EP1113516) as applied to claim 1-3, 5-6, 12 above, and in view of Amrhein (US2003/0124399).

Rock is silent about the burner is operated by hydrogen and is a gas burner.

Amrhein teaches using residual hydrogen from fuel cell unit to operate the burner with improved total energy efficiency of the fuel cell apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to adopt the hydrogen to operate the burner as taught by Amrhein to practice the burner of Rock because hydrogen operating the burner can help utilize the residual hydrogen fuel from fuel cell thus improve the energy efficiency. It is to be noted that a hydrogen burner is already a gas burner and one of ordinary skill in the art would have been obvious to choose an efficient gas burner such as a high-performance gas burner as recited in the instant claims to improve the energy utilization efficiency.

4. Claim 8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rock et al (EP1113516) as applied to claim 1-3, 5-6, 12 above, and in view of Bloomfield(US3976507).

Rock already teaches an air compressor (Fig, [0015]) wherein supplying oxygen to the fuel cell and burner is an expected feature associated with this compressor.

Regarding claim 8 and 10-11, Rock is silent using same compressor to supply air for both burner and fuel cell and the adjusting the ratio of the air.

Bloomfield teaches using a compressor (item 40) supplying air to both fuel cell stack (item 12) and a burner (item 20) via an air control box (item 48) a certain volume ratio of air supplied to fuel cell stack and burner respectively (Fig

Art Unit: 1793

1, col 3 ln 52-65, col 5 ln 1-5) wherein the gas supplied to the burner need be enough to drive the compressor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention filed to one compressor for supplying air to both fuel cell stack and burner via an air box controller to provide enough force from the burner for driving the compressor as shown by Bloomfield (col 3 ln 52-65, col 5 ln 1-5). Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been obvious to adopt a proper air volume ratio between burner and fuel cell stack such as recited in the instant claims via routine optimization (See § MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] II).

5. Claim 13 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rock et al (EP1113516) as applied to claim 1-3, 5-6, 12 above, and in view of Fuller (US6068941).

Rock is silent about using a starter battery to supply power to auxiliaries.

Fuller teaches using a battery as an auxiliary power source to operate the air blower (item 30) and water pump for providing reactant for the fuel cell (col 3 ln 1-27, Figure). Fuller also discloses when the fuel cell reaches a certain temperature a normal fuel cell operation will start thus terminating the auxiliary power source such as battery is expected because normal fuel cell operation can already providing electric current.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention filed to adopt a starter battery to help providing reactants and heating for the fuel cell to reach a normal operation as shown by Fuller.

Conclusion

All the claims are rejected for the reasons of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUN LI whose telephone number is (571)270-5858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am-5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Mayes can be reached on 571-272-1234. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 1793

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JUN LI/

Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/J. L./

08/20/2009

/Melvin Curtis Mayes/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793